DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 267 JC 850 020

AUTHOR Farland, Ronnald W.
TITLE Remediation in the California Community Colleges: Proposals for Board Policies and Actions.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 24p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 2 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, January 24-25, 1985). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; College Credits; *Community Colleges; Definitions; *Educational Needs; Policy Formation; *Remedial Instruction; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

Developed by the Chancellor's Task Force on Academic Quality, this report presents background, analysis, and recommendations concerning remedial offerings in the California community colleges. Part I presents background material on the scope of remediation in the colleges, and the student constituencies and social conditions that have created the need for remediation. Part II cites existing operational definitions of remedial education, noting the inadequacies of each, and proposes a new definition of remediation as appropriate for community colleges: "Remediation is that process which is designed to assist students to attain those learning skills necessary to succeed in college transfer, certificate, or degree courses and programs..." Part III discusses and responds to recommendations made in the California Postsecondary Education Commission's Report "Promises to Keep," concerning the respective roles of the postsecondary educational segments; policies regarding credit for remedial courses; processes of evaluating remediation; and relationships with adult schools. Part IV presents a Task Force proposal for establishing state policy regarding remediation among the various educational segments. Finally, part V contains the specific actions which the Task Force recommended for consideration by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Hayward
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED253267

Item 2

Title: Remediation in the California Community Colleges: Proposals for Board Policies and Actions

Staff Presentation: Ronnald W. Farland, Administrator
Special Projects

Summary

1. This item is a report to the Chancellor from the Task Force on Academic Quality. In addition to being reviewed by the Board as information, it is being distributed to districts for review and comment. It is anticipated that staff analysis and recommendations on this subject will be brought to the Board for action in May 1985.

2. A major dimension of the work of the Task Force on Academic Quality is to review provisions in the colleges of remedial education and, as necessary, recommend statewide policies. The most obvious impetus for this charge to the Task Force is the need to respond to the recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission's report of a major study, Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. The Board of Governors has recognized the magnitude of remedial offerings in the colleges, including the implications of it for the roles and missions of the colleges, and has committed itself to develop policy on the role and purposes of remediation in connection with its 1985 Basic Agenda.

3. This item begins with a brief description of the scope of remediation in community colleges and of the student constituencies and societal conditions that have created the need for it, and is followed in Section II by a discussion of what constitutes remediation in the community college setting. This section proposes that the purpose of providing remediation in the colleges is "... to bring students to skill levels which enable them to perform successfully in college level degree and certificate courses," and includes a definition for eventual Board adoption.

4. Section III of this item includes discussion of and responses to recommendations made in CPEC's Promises to Keep. Among the major policy issues contained in this section are:

   a) A proposal that the Chancellor endorse a recommendation that community colleges "... be considered the primary postsecondary providers of remedial courses and services ..." by urging the Board to 1) adopt a policy statement to that effect, and 2) amend its existing "Statewide Mission" statement to reflect the proper role of remediation among the colleges' functions;

JC 850 020

b) Proposals that the Chancellor seek Board direction to take several actions designed to improve articulation between colleges and high schools in order to strengthen the preparation of high school students for college;

c) A proposal that the Board take an action to eliminate the practice of granting degree credit for remedial courses;

d) A statement that in the long run the Board may need to strengthen the requirements for districts to evaluate all courses and programs and that because of the public policy urgency about remediation, it ought to begin by taking steps to improve the evaluation of courses in that area; and

e) In response to a recommendation that community colleges should "... establish an academic floor below which instruction would not be offered...", proposals that the Chancellor should seek Board approval to 1) evaluate remedial offerings over at least two years after the implementation of matriculation, and 2) in the meantime, encourage the conduct of a comparative study of the effectiveness of remediation in community colleges and adult schools. Results of these two activities could then be used to determine whether the concept of an "academic floor" is viable as state educational policy.

5. Finally, Section IV presents a broad proposal, developed by the Task Force on Academic Quality, for establishing state policy for providing remediation among the various segments of education.

6. Section V contains the specific actions which the Task Force recommends the Chancellor bring to the Board.

PREFACE FROM THE CHANCELLOR

The text included in this item was prepared to represent the advice of the Task Force on Academic Quality to the Chancellor in response to that part of its charge concerning remediation. Normally, advisory group recommendations are analyzed and used as references by staff as it develops recommended for the Board. In this case, however, the scope and complexity of the issues addressed deserves not only additional review by and comment from the colleges but also a comparable period of deliberation by the Board. For that reason, I am sharing the Task Force's report with the Board for information at this time, and have directed staff to distribute it widely among community college constituents and to seek further review and comment before I recommend Board action. Staff analysis and recommendations will be brought to the Board for information in April, and I propose that action be taken in May, 1985.

I. BACKGROUND

> *"Underpreparedness in the college bound or for others is not, nor has it ever been, a temporary problem which will someday disappear if one just waits long enough. It is, instead, a problem of enormous magnitude and complexity in need of long-range solutions rather than short-term holding actions."*
>
> *"Remediation has become a pervasive issue, affecting the very heart of the educational endeavor. Administrators worry about it; faculty are daily faced with it; students suffer from it; newspapers inveigh against it; and the public pays for it."*

These two comments, from the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) 1982 report, Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities, effectively state the basic reasons the Chancellor, in Spring, 1983, identified remediation as one of the several interrelated educational issues to be addressed by the Task Force on Academic Quality.

As Promises To Keep points out, in 1980-81 in the California Community Colleges, enrollments in remedial reading and writing courses comprised 45 percent of all English enrollments, and enrollments in remedial mathematics courses comprised 57 percent of all mathematics enrollments, not to mention the myriad of other remedial instruction and support services which are made available to students in other discipline areas or in a non-instructional mode.[1] The cost of remediation in that year, according to what the Commission report cautions was a conservative estimate, was $66.3 million. In the four intervening years since 1980-81, community colleges have further increased their remedial instruction and have also begun to "count" as remedial many offerings not so categorized at that time. Thus, the costs associated with remediation are substantially greater than estimated at the time of the Commission Study.

And the magnitude of enrollments and cost are not the only reasons why remediation is a pervasive issue. As may be seen in the other item from the work of the Task Force on Academic Quality in this agenda, the rising prominence of remediation as a necessary function of postsecondary education is also at least perceived to have blurred the distinctions between what is and is not "collegiate level" work, thereby appearing to lower the standards of institutions and to create confusion and/or false standards among students.

But, as the Commission report also makes clear, resolution of the "issue" of remediation in all segments of postsecondary education cannot be accomplished by merely identifying and eradicating remedial offerings in the interest of keeping colleges "pure." It exists because the need for remediation is real. It is a fact that one of every five adult Americans lacks the reading, writing and computational skills to handle the minimal demands of daily living, and an additional one of every three can function, but not proficiently.[2] In part, these startling statistics are due

to the decline of reading, writing and computational competencies among recent high school graduates. As a result of public concern and recent legislative actions to improve standards in the public schools, it is reasonable to expect that high school curricula and student competencies will be strengthened over time, resulting eventually in less need for colleges to provide remediation for this part of the population. On the other hand, the continuing influx of re-entry persons shows no signs of abating, and this population, because of time lapses in their educational experience, often demonstrates need for strenghtening basic skills through remediation. In addition, adult refugee and other in-migration populations continue to grow, and they also seek necessary language and computational skills. Further, there is public policy pressure on the University and State University to reduce the extent of their remedial offerings, and they may increasingly seek cooperative arrangements with community colleges to fill that need. Finally, if the implementation of matriculation in California has effects similar to those in New Jersey and other states that have mandated assessment and skills pre-requisites for college level courses, there is likely to be found, at least initially, a substantially greater need for remediation than is currently offered. For all these reasons, the community colleges can expect to continue to enroll, in the decade ahead, students who are underprepared for college work and who are in need of remediation.

This being the case, it is essential that the Chancellor and Board of Governors be 1) apprised of what are considered to be the major issues in the provision of remediation in California's public education, 2) deliberate alternative resolutions to those issues that are within its purview, and 3) establish or modify policies that make clear the appropriate roles of community colleges in meeting the educational needs of skill-deficient adults. Section II of this item presents the views of the Task Force on Academic Quality regarding a definition of remediation and the purposes for which it ought to be offered in community colleges. Section III sets out the recommendations from Promises to Keep under several topic headings and, where appropriate, proposes Board responses or positions. Section IV presents what is considered a preferred alternative approach to that implicit in Promises to Keep regarding the issue of delineating segmental roles in the provision of remediation. Finally, Section V contains proposals for specific policies and actions which should be presented to the Board for adoption.

II. THE DEFINITION AND PURPOSES OF REMEDIATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The charge to the Task Force was to deliberate the recommendations contained in Promises to Keep and, considering the current provision of remediation and other conditions in the colleges, recommend to the Chancellor Board responses, including policy statements and, where appropriate, other actions. In its earliest discussions of this charge, the Task Force's Sub-committee on Remediation recognized that before it could take up the several policy issues that have been raised, it would first need to come to grips with two basic questions. They are:

1. What is remediation in the community college context? and

2. For what purpose or purposes might remediation be provided in community colleges?

Existing Definitions: CPEC and LARC

Members were informed in their deliberations by the discussion and the operational definition contained in Promises to Keep, by a set of related terms and definitions developed by the Learning Assessment and Retention Consortium (LARC), and by their own diverse and extensive involvements with remediation on their campuses. The following language from the CPEC report begins to suggest the complexity of the definitional problem:

> *"The term remediation has become so emotionally charged that many writers prefer to use what they consider less offensive euphemisms. Although their aim may be laudatory, the result is often confusion... To exacerbate the situation, little if any differentiation is drawn between the synonyms used, and the reader is confronted with a plethora of words all ostensibly meaning the same thing -- remediation, compensatory, developmental, basic skills, learning skills, and the like. Although their unifying feature is to attempt to prepare students for regular college work, subtle yet important differences exist among all these terms..."*[3]

Some of these "...subtle yet important differences" in terms are reflected in the schema proposed by LARC for use in California's community colleges. LARC begins by positing a rather straightforward assumption that there exist a variety of "learning skills" which are needed to perform successfully in college. Some of these LARC calls "fundamental" learning skills, such as reading, writing and computation, which one might reasonably expect to have been honed to an appropriate level by one's education prior to entering college. Those college offerings which attempt to correct deficiencies in these "fundamental skills" LARC refers to as "remedial." Some other learning skills are categorized as "supplemental" or "process" skills, such as note taking, listening, study skills or how to use a library. College efforts to address these skill needs LARC refers to as "developmental."

The CPEC report, while acknowledging the utility at the campus level of these and many other subtle distinctions and terms, chose, for its methodological purposes, to use the term "remediation" to refer to all those "...courses and support services needed to overcome student deficiencies in reading, writing and mathematics to a level at which students have a reasonable chance of succeeding in regular college courses...." It went on to make the term operational, for purposes of uniformity in data gathering, to include courses as:

1. reading courses which provide aid to students reading below the twelfth-grade level;

2. writing courses below the transfer-level freshman composition course (often known as English 1A);

3. mathematics courses in arithmetic, elementary algebra, plane geometry, intermediate algebra, and courses whose content consists primarily of these subjects; and

4. English as a Second Language courses taught to students whose primary language is not English in order to prepare them for regular college courses.

In addition, participating colleges were advised to include data on other support services if they included a remedial component. In the presentation of its findings in Promises to Keep, CPEC acknowledged that these specific operational definitions may not have been entirely appropriate for community colleges. Specifically, the CPEC report suggested that certain mathematics courses, counted as remedial for UC and CSU, might be legitimately considered appropriate for associate degree and certificate programs in community colleges (e.g., intermediate and, possibly, elementary algebra). In addition, it acknowledged that English as a Second Language courses need not necessarily all be considered remedial in any of the segments. Still, the compiled data presented on the cost and other dimensions were based on the operational definitions.

In their own deliberations, the Task Force found areas of agreement and disagreement with both of these ways of conceptualizing remediation. The LARC definitions and distinctions are useful, they concluded, for helping one begin to grasp the range of skills deficiencies that exists among students and for understanding the scope of courses and services that must be provided to overcome those deficiencies if the policy of open access is to be maintained. Even the LARC distinctions, however, do not include all of the efforts which colleges make to remove barriers to student success, especially those delivered by support services areas. For example, one of the frequently found "blocks" to learning among underrepresented minority students -- and one which often transcends the question of deficiencies in language or computational skills -- is a lack of confidence or self-esteem with respect to doing college level work. Typically, this situation is dealt with in a counseling or other support service mode and should, in the Task Force's view, be considered part of the remediation process.

It is important to reiterate also that the definition employed by CPEC is questionable for community colleges in at least two important respects, even though that report itself acknowledges these as areas of dispute.

1. While it is correct that remediation should include those courses which attempt to raise students' skills to the level that will enable them to do college level work, CPEC's operational definitions appear to be based upon a traditional or historic concept of "college level." That is, it assumes not only that all entering college students have completed high school, but also that they have completed the same model, sequenced curriculum or course of study. That model has not predominated in California high schools for some time, so even those entering students who have completed high school often take the traditional courses for the first time in college. Therefore, consistent with the standards recommended elsewhere in the Task Force's Report on Associate Degree-applicable courses, (See Item 1), some courses in the community college curriculum which might be considered less than baccalaureate level would, nonetheless, be college level and, therefore, not remedial (e.g., intermediate algebra, geometry, etc.).

2. English as a Second Language should not be classed as remedial. ESL, while it may be taught at a remedial level if the students are deficient in skills in their native languages or if they have learning problems, may also be taught at the associate or baccalaureate level. For example, colleges in all segments offer an ESL course which receives credit as English 1A. Course content, criteria and evaluation are identical to the regular English 1A. The only significant differences are that this course is recommended for students whose primary language is other than English and instructors of these courses are trained to recognize special problems faced by these students, such as the use of idioms or misinterpretations brought about by literal translations.

The Proposed Definition

In the process of critiquing these prior efforts to define remediation, the Task Force gradually developed a consensus that permitted it to make its own affirmative statements about the purpose and nature of remediation in community colleges. Two important assumptions were key in developing the policy statement that is proposed below for eventual Board adoption. They are:

1. Remediation in community colleges is not merely instruction designed to correct deficiencies in basic language and computational skills. Rather, because the open access mission of the colleges is intended to accommodate young people and adults whose "blocks" to successful academic performance result from a variety of experiences and learning skills deficiencies, remediation must be defined as a process which includes a variety of prescriptive interventions to remove barriers or develop learning skills. These prescriptive interventions may take many forms, including such things as instruction to correct skill deficiencies, development of general study skills, provision of tutorial assistance and specialized assessment, counseling, advisement and placement.

2. The purpose of providing remediation in community colleges is to bring students to skill levels which enable them to perform successfully in college level degree and certificate courses.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the Chancellor urge the Board to adopt the following definition of remediation as appropriate for community colleges:

> Remediation is that process which is designed to assist students to attain those learning skills necessary to succeed in college transfer, certificate or degree courses and programs, and includes classroom instruction as well as other prescriptive interventions to assist students in the pursuit of their educational goals and objectives.

III. PROPOSED RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF PROMISES TO KEEP

As suggested in the opening section of this item, the phenomenon of widespread remediation in postsecondary education has been a long time in the making and is the product of several societal forces. The publication by CPEC in 1982 of Promises to Keep: Remediation in California's Public Colleges and Universities served the important purpose of focusing many of the issues about remediation and, perhaps as important, elevated those issues to prominence as public policy concerns, thus stimulating activity on several fronts to achieve their resolution. This section sets forth proposals for Board responses, developed by the Task Force on Academic Quality, to the recommendations contained in Promises. It should be noted that the development of the responses has been a complex and arduous task. This is true not only because the recommendations themselves contain complex educational policy and governance implications, but also because CPEC was successful in stimulating much debate on the issues in many arenas during the period of the Task Force's deliberations. Thus, the Legislature, the Board, policy making bodies of the other segments and the campuses of all the segments have already taken actions that respond in some way to the recommendations. Staff and members of the Task Force have endeavored to become apprised of these "in-course" developments and, to the extent possible, incorporate them into the proposed responses. Additionally, the Task Force early-on took exception to what it viewed as an overriding implication of the CPEC report that the roles of the segments in providing remediation can or ought to be defined from the state level. Thus, while this section contains responses to each of the recommendations relevant to community colleges, there is provided, in Section IV, a preferred alternative course of action regarding those particular recommendations which have to do with defining the segments' roles in providing remediation.

A. Delineating the Roles of the Postsecondary Segments

A major purpose for the CPEC study reported in Promises to Keep was to review the existing provisions of remediation in the public postsecondary segments with an eye to deriving a more coherent public policy than currently exists. In so doing, the Commission made several recommendations regarding the appropriate roles of each segment in providing remediation and the necessary intersegmental cooperative arrangements that would be required among the postsecondary segments to implement and maintain those roles.

After reviewing the existing provision of remediation in the postsecondary segments, CPEC concluded that the University of California and the California State University should reduce their remedial offerings and that public policy should acknowledge community colleges as the primary postsecondary provider of remediation. The specific CPEC recommendations relevant to these conclusions, numbered as in the report, are as follows:

1. *That the University of California and the California State University each develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a plan whose goal is to reduce remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language within a five-year period to a level consonant with the principles of both quality and access as determined by each segment. In developing such plans, the segments should take into account the anticipated effects of increased admissions requirements and the steps taken by the high schools to improve student preparation. These plans shall be transmitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for review and comment.*

2. *That the University of California and the California State University in the interim continue to offer or make available remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language to the degree dictated by the needs of incoming students as determined by appropriate assessment. In the interest of better coordination and integration, each segment should examine the means by which its campuses offer remediation in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, in order to ensure maximum quality responsiveness to student need, lowest cost, and least duplication.*

3. *That the University of California and the California State University explore cooperative arrangements with institutions such as Community Colleges and K-12 adult schools to provide remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language.*

5. *That the California Community Colleges continue to be considered in the long term as the primary postsecondary provider of remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language in the State in addition to their academic, vocational, and community service functions.*

There is unanimity in the Task Force in support of Recommendation 5, that community colleges continue to be considered the primary postsecondary provider of remediation in California. Community colleges already do provide by far the most extensive, high quality remedial instruction and services to be found, and the the combination of their accumulated expertise and their function as open access institutions make them the logical segment for providing the remediation needed by the bulk of California college students. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the two related actions be taken to affirm the community colleges' primary role.

First, the Chancellor should ask the Board to adopt the following policy statement developed by the Task Force on Academic Quality:

> "As open access institutions charged with accepting for enrollment adults eighteen years of age or older who are able to profit from instruction, the California Community Colleges have an inherent responsibility, within the limits of the funding provided to them, to assist students to attain levels of proficiency needed for success in transfer, certificate and degree courses by providing high quality remedial instruction and support services."

Second, the Board should amend its statement of "Statewide Mission" as follows:

> "Community College districts ~~should~~ will provide remedial ~~and basic skills education~~ instruction and services for students needing preparation for community college level courses and programs in accordance with formal delineation of function agreements with other public education institutions in their service areas. Representative activities are:
>
> > remedial courses for students with educational deficiencies;
> >
> > developmental ~~courses and/or programs~~ assistance for students with special learning problems;
> >
> > ongoing diagnostic/prescription programs providing for individual student skills needs."

There is also agreement in the Task Force that there is general need for increased intersegmental cooperation in the provision of remediation, as suggested by Recommendations 1-3, as well as Recommendations 8, 9 and 13, which are considered later in this item. At the same time, the Task Force does not believe that such increased cooperation would necessarily lead to a substantial reduction of the remediation currently offered by the University and State University. The Task Force recommends that the Chancellor oppose any state level policy effort to shift that responsibility, categorically or statewide, to other segments of education. In its response to Promises, the University of California makes the following statement which is consistent with the Task Force's view in this area:

> *"Experiments underway in cooperating with community colleges will be evaluated and extended where warranted; but it remains fundamentally the University's responsibility to help its students correct weaknesses in their academic preparation. The University must retain sufficient control over the remedial instruction needed to bring entering students up to its standards in order to guarantee that those standards remain at their current high level. As entering students' academic preparation improves, remedial instruction can be reduced accordingly."*

In the same vein, the Task Force takes the position that individual institutions, regardless of segmental affiliation, are best able to understand the needs of their student constituencies and best able to design educational strategies to meet those needs, utilizing the resources available in the institutions. Both the extent of need for remediation and the available resources to meet the need vary from one locale to another. Therefore, should an individual UC or CSU campus determine, in consultation with a community college, that some or all of its remediation needs are better provided by that community college, there is nothing in existing public policy to prohibit such an arrangement. In fact, existing arrangements between UC San Diego and San Diego Mesa College and between UC Berkeley and the colleges of the Peralta District are examples of what can be accomplished through voluntary, intersegmental cooperation.

Further the Task Force cautions that at least two potentially negative impacts could result from public policy that would shift a significant portion of UC's and CSU's remediation responsibilities to the community colleges. First, as has already been noted, community colleges are already impacted, to varying degrees, by the need to provide extensive remediation. If they were to assume responsibility for the current responsibilities of UC and CSU, there could be created on some campuses a critical imbalance in the curriculum, making it difficult to maintain a milieu supportive of the primary transfer and vocational functions. Second, such a shift would require a large infusion of money, staff and facilities for community colleges and a concomitant reduction for UC and CSU. Failure to provide such resources could seriously jeopardize the already marginally funded community college programs.

B. Dealing with Underpreparation: Community Colleges and the High Schools

As suggested earlier, a significant factor in the expansion of remediation in community colleges has been the need to respond to the steadily declining skill levels of recent high school graduates. The CPEC report acknowledges that impact on all segments of postsecondary education and makes several recommendations regarding how colleges and universities can stimulate and supplement efforts by the high schools to improve standards for student preparation, with the intent of diminishing, at least somewhat, the need for remediation in the postsecondary segments. Among these are the following:

8. *That the Community College districts enter into delineation of function agreements with feeder high school/ districts within their boundaries regarding preparatory activities and courses in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language; such agreements may include cooperative arrangements for serving underprepared adults. The articulation agreements shall be transmitted to the Board of Governors.*

9. a) *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges work with the University of California and the California State University to assist high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project.*

   b) *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges encourage the Community College districts to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.*

15. *That all three segments, in the interest of improved articulation, explore with the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education the possibility of using appropriate postsecondary diagnostic tests so that high school students can be assured of consistent expectations between high schools and colleges and thus be encouraged to obtain the necessary skills before entering college.*

The Task Force recommends that the Chancellor support the general focus of these recommendations on the need to improve articulation between postsecondary institutions and high schools. At the same time, it is acknowledged that, should the specific suggested activities be mandated from the State level, adequate resources to support such efforts would need to be provided.

Nevertheless, there is mounting evidence that significant articulation efforts of the types suggested are being undertaken, with and without special funding. The Statement on Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen, prepared by the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California, provides an excellent basis for cross-segment articulation discussions at the local level that is exemplary in response to recommendation 9A. The Senates are currently developing a similar statement for the natural sciences. What is needed at this point are systematic efforts to use The Statement on Competencies as a basis for dialogue among English and mathematics faculties across segments. To encourage this, the Chancellor should work with the Roundtable on Educational Opportunity to continue to revitalize and extend the functions and budget of the California Articulation Council to include sponsorship of regular regional meetings of high school and college faculty by discipline groupings.

Although they do not necessarily result in formal "delineation of function agreements", several community colleges have undertaken comprehensive articulation efforts with feeder high schools. For example, the Chancellor and the Board heard a report in July 1984 of the project initiated by Gavilan College to articulate course content and standards across the curriculum with all its feeder high schools and San Jose State University. That project is exemplary not only because it has resulted in on-going dialogue among discipline faculties across all three segments, but because it has involved state level policy advisors on its advisory committee, thus increasing the likelihood of the model being replicated elsewhere.

Similarly, Sacramento City College's "Articulation Council Project" with the Sacramento City Unified School District has, in its brief two-year history, already resulted in significant curriculum reform -- including the establishment of the Science, Math and Engineering Institute at predominantly minority Luther Burbank High School -- and greatly expanded cooperation in assessing and diagnosing the skills of high school students. In the past year that project has been conjoined with the Los Rios District's already existing cooperation with UC Davis and Cal State Chico in the UC/CSU Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project. Again, the project has resulted in on-going communication among faculty across the segments as well as a process which enables high school students to correct skills deficiencies while still in high school.

In addition to the efforts of these and many other individual colleges, the Legislature, as part of its K-12 reform measures in 1983, established the concept of the California Academic Partnership Program to support intersegmental efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools. In 1984, AB 2398 (Hughes) refined the intent of the Partnership Program as "improving the preparation of all students for college," designated CSU to administer the program in cooperation with the UC Regents, the Board of Governors and the Department of Education, and provided funds to make the program operational. The Academic Partnership Program will provide incentives for some community colleges to expand their articulation efforts with high schools, but its budget is small in comparison to the amount of work to be done. The Chancellor should direct the Board's staff representation on the Partnership Advisory committee to support policies and procedures for project funding that give priority to multi-institution proposals and proposals that demonstrate significant fiscal commitment from other sources. The Chancellor should also seek Board approval to increase fiscal support for the Partnership program.

With regard to Recommendation 9b, the Task Force suggests that the Board's previous actions in approving the Student Matriculation Plan and seeking funding for its implementation have laid the groundwork for making possible the reporting back to high schools on the skills levels of entering students. The Chancellor should seek the Board's direction to: (1) include as a criterion in matriculation funding that colleges include in their plans a proposal to provide feeder

high schools with information on the skills levels and subsequent academic performance of their students; and (2) assure that staffing for articulation in the Chancellor's Office be used to facilitate local efforts in articulation with high schools as well as four-year colleges.

Finally, in response to Recommendation 15, the Task Force recommends that the Chancellor seek direction from the Board to explore with the Roundtable on Educational Opportunity the possibility of forming an intersegmental work group, including the Department of Education, to identify and review the diagnostic and assessment tests currently in use in the segments as well as the existing cooperation between postsecondary and secondary institutions in the use of those tests. If appropriate, that group could make recommendations for improved coordination and/or expansion of those efforts or, at minimum, publicize those that have been productive.

C. Remediation and Credit

Another set of major policy issues raised by the CPEC report dealt with the granting of credit for remedial coursework and, in some cases, the application of that credit to baccalaureate and associate degrees. Promises to Keep found that these practices were widespread in all segments and made the following recommendations:

10. *That neither the University of California nor the California State University shall grant baccalaureate credit for courses in reading, writing, and mathematics defined by the faculty as remedial in accord with each system's policy and that the award of workload credit should not affect the level of State funding for these remedial courses. Furthermore, that the University of California and the California State University shall describe the courses defined as remedial and report the number of students enrolled in the workload generated in these courses to the Commission by December 1, 1983, and during the following five years in which the University and the California State University implement their plans to reduce remediation.*

11. *That the segments examine their policies and procedures to ensure that remedial coursework not granted baccalaureate degree credit by a four-year institution also not be identified as transfer credit by a two-year institution.*

12. *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that the Community College districts examine their policies and procedures regarding the granting of associate degree credit to remedial courses.*

The Task Force is in agreement with these recommendations and has recommended Board actions to implement them in the Report on Associate Degree Standards [See Agenda Item 1]. More specifically, that report proposes Title 5 language that establishes standards of rigor for courses that can apply to the associate degree. In effect, those standards would define all credit coursework that is not degree applicable to be remedial and would, therefore, prohibit degree credit for remediation in the future.

D. Evaluation of Remediation

After documenting the scope and estimating the cost of remediation in community colleges, the CPEC report suggests that, unlike the CSU and UC, the long-standing open access mandate for community colleges has attracted a range of students and created a range of programs which justifies, at this time, extensive provision of remedial courses and services; hence the recommendation, noted earlier, that community colleges continue to be considered the primary postsecondary providers. That recommendation is not made without qualification, however. The report reads:

> *"If the practice of open admissions is to continue, then the Community Colleges have the responsibility to serve those students whom they admit. At the same time, in order to fulfill their responsibility both to the student and to society, the Community Colleges also must ensure that standards and progress are maintained."*

Additionally, the report finds that efforts to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of remedial offerings are almost non-existent in all the segments. Thus the following recommendations are offered:

7. *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that all Community College districts establish comprehensive assessment/placement, advising, and follow-up programs to ensure adequate progress of remedial students. (Also see Recommendation 14.)*

14. *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges develop a set of alternative models for assessment/placement which individual colleges can adapt to the needs of their students (Also see Recommendation 7.)*

16. *That each segment develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a rigorous program evaluation model for remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, using some common criteria and common vocabulary to ensure comparability across segments and report the implementation on their campuses in their 1985 report.*

By approving Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation in the California Community Colleges and by seeking funding in the 1985-86 Budget to expand the implementation of matriculation to include half of the colleges, the Board has already begun to implement CPEC's Recommendations 7 and 14. The Task Force recommends that the Chancellor urge the Board to continue its efforts to secure additional funds to enable all community colleges to implement matriculation by Fall 1986.

Regarding Recommendation 16, the Task Force takes the position that there is need to improve the processes for evaluating the effectiveness of all courses and programs throughout the curriculum, not just remedial courses. It would prefer, therefore, that actions be taken to make more rigorous the existing overall program review regulations. At the same time, the Task Force acknowledges that the urgency of current public interest in whether remedial programs are effective begs for a focus on remediation in the short run.

To that end, a number of responsive activities are already underway or about to be launched. In Spring 1984, over 100 community college faculty and staff attended an intersegmental workshop on evaluation, sponsored by CPEC, which was intended to stimulate segmental efforts to evaluate remedial offerings. As a result, several participants voluntarily organized an Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Remediation and undertook to survey existing practices in the colleges and to develop an evaluation matrix which could be used by other colleges. Subsequently, the Chancellor convened an advisory group comprised of members of the Remediation Sub-Committee of the Task Force and other college personnel many of whom were members of the voluntary group. Materials developed by the voluntary group were used in six regional workshops in October 1984 for the purpose of encouraging colleges to undertake or expand their evaluations of remedial instruction.

Recently CPEC has made available funds from another grant from the federal Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to permit five community colleges to develop and pilot test evaluation models during Spring semester, 1985. The results of these pilots should be shared with other colleges during the 1985-86 academic year. By Fall 1986 all colleges should have implemented a rigorous evaluation process appropriate to their own needs, and that by Spring 1987 the Chancellor should be able to provide CPEC with a descriptive summary of the evaluation processes being used in the colleges and at least preliminary outcomes from some of them.

In addition, if funding to implement matriculation is secured for 1985-86, the contracted three-year evaluation of matriculation should include a dimension which evaluates remedial offerings with a focus on the public policy concerns in the area. The individual college efforts described above should be very useful in the state level effort.

E. Delineation with Adult Schools: The "Academic Floor"

As seen earlier, Recommendation #8 from the CPEC report suggested that "delineation of function agreements" with feeder high school districts might, in addition to improving articulation between high school and college curricula, also"... include cooperative arrangements for serving underprepared adults." (emphasis added).

Elsewhere in the report, CPEC recommends:

> 6. *That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges establish an academic floor below which instruction would not be offered. That they redirect students below this level to the adult basic education program operated either by the local community college or school district. A reasonable period of time should be allowed before this floor is instituted.*

Existing law gives first responsibility for the provision of what has been known as "adult basic education" to adult schools. By local agreement, adult schools may exist under the auspices of either high school districts or community college districts; but, in either case, the rate of state ADA support is significantly lower than for credit offerings in community colleges.

The Task Force commends CPEC for acknowleding that implementation of a "floor," if it is appropriate at all, will require time for careful deliberation. The Task Force believes that the following preliminary steps must be accomplished before taking any public policy action to implement a floor (or floors) in community colleges.

1. Comprehensive assessment, advisement, placement and student follow-up processes must be established in all (or nearly all) community colleges in order to provide baseline data regarding the extent and types of remediation needs exhibited by students who enroll. Implementation of matriculation in the colleges will provide this capacity.

2. An intensive effort must be mounted to evaluate the effectiveness of remediation in the colleges, utilizing baseline data gathered in assessment programs. Though such an effort should be coordinated statewide, it should allow for individual college variations in tests as well as variations in other evaluation components or methodologies utilized. The evaluation processes developed by the colleges during 1984-86 and the methodologies employed in the matriculation evaluation would be the bases for the effort.

3. At least two full years of longitudinal data on student progress through remedial programs in a majority of the colleges should be available before considering whether an academic floor or floors should be established for community colleges.

4. In the meantime, a careful comparative study should be made of remedial offerings in community colleges and adult basic education courses in adult schools.

The comparative study is particularly important to the eventual policy decision about a "floor". The recommendation to shift responsibility for the lowest levels of remediation to the adult schools, while it may be attractive for fiscal reasons, may be short-sighted in terms of its possible educational outcomes. Therefore, among the questions that ought to be addressed in the study are these:

a) Is the quality of remedial instruction in community colleges higher, either because the purpose of remediation in community colleges is more focused (i.e., to bring student skills to college level) or because the legal requirements for teacher credentialling and overall course conduct are significantly more rigorous?

b) Does the availability of ancillary support services and other interventions for remedial students in community colleges and their absence in adult schools have a significant effect on students' chances of benefitting from remedial instruction?

c) Since state and federal policies prohibit the award of student financial aid to students enrolled in non-credit adult school courses, would the assignment of more remedial work to adult schools discourage low-income students who aspire to college from taking the necessary first step of removing skills deficiencies?

IV. SEGMENTAL ROLES IN PROVIDING REMEDIATION: THE PREFERRED TASK FORCE APPROACH:

As noted earlier, the Task Force on Academic Quality would take issue with any assumption that it is necessary or appropriate to define what amount, type or level of remediation should be provided by institutions in each segment on a statewide basis. Instead, the Task Force recommends that the State should take a clear policy position that the remediation needs of its citizens will be met by its public educational institutions, establish guidelines or standards for that provision and then charge the postsecondary institutions -- adult education, community colleges, CSU, and UC -- to develop delineation of function agreements on a regional basis. Regions would be defined, so far as possible, by the natural spheres of association that develop among institutions in proximity to each other, based on the commonalities of constituencies and conditions that exist in the area. Institutions in a region would be required by the State to develop delineation of function agreements to coordinate their remediation functions to assure that students have the opportunity to progress on an orderly continuum toward meeting their learning skill needs.

The State guidelines or standards upon which the agreements would be based might include:

1. A definition of remediation which incorporates the concept of a learning continuum based upon student needs.

2. A policy that postsecondary institutions in each segment have first responsibility for providing the remedial help needed by the students they admit.

3. A requirement that remediation be provided for those who are assessed as needing it.

4. A requirement that institutions in a region agree on a procedure to ensure that students' remediation needs are met between and within institutions.

5. A requirement that agreements be developed among postsecondary institutions and high schools in a region regarding skills proficiencies needed for college success.

6. A requirement that in the interest of continually evaluating and improving the intersegmental arrangements for providing remediation, institutions in a region share assessment results and student outcome data with one another and with the appropriate state agencies.

In setting forth this regional, intersegmental approach as an alternative to the State's further delineating the roles of the segments in providing remediation, the Task Force is mindful that the Board of Governors is not in a position to implement it unilaterally. Intersegmental consensus on the basic principles of the proposal would first need to be obtained, and then much joint work would need to be done on the details of implementation. Given the existing governance distinctions among the segments, varying geographic dispersion of institutions in each segment, and the long-standing traditions of each in providing remediation, achieving such consensus is no small challenge. Nevertheless, the Task Force believes that the proposal has the advantage of allowing for local variations in need and institutional capability, and encouraging communication and cooperation among the segments, rather than preserving or defining separate educational islands, each with its own parochial interests. Perhaps more important, it encourages segmental and institutional responses which are based on students' needs and, thereby, reduces students' chances of getting lost in the system.

Therefore, the Task Force proposes that the Chancellor seek Board approval to develop and present a proposal to the Roundtable on Educational Opportunity to pursue its recommendation for an intersegmental approach to providing remediation in California public education.

V. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

On the basis of conclusions presented here, the Task Force on Academic Quality proposes that the Chancellor take the following recommendations to the Board of Governors for action:

1. Approve the definition of remediation on page __ and direct staff, with further advice from the Task Force, to propose modifications to the Course Classification System and other necessary amendments to Title 5 that are consistent with the definition;

2. Adopt as Board policy the statement on page __ regarding the role of community colleges in providing remediation;

3. Adopt the proposed modification to the Board's Statement of Mission found on page __;

4. Direct the Chancellor to seek legislation to authorize the implementation, funding and evaluation of matriculation in the community colleges and to give priority in funding to colleges which agree to share assessment and student performance data with feeder high schools and to participate in a state-level evaluation of remedial courses;

5. Direct the Chancellor to assign staffing to cover articulation with high schools as well as with baccalaureate institutions;

6. Direct the Chancellor to seek the cooperation of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in conducting a joint comparative study of remediation in community colleges and adult schools and use the results as a basis for reviewing and, as necessary, amending state policy;

7. Direct the Chancellor to seek the cooperation of all public education segments, through the Roundtable on Educational Opportunity, to:

   (a) establish an intersegmental work group, including the State Department of Education, to identify and review assessment and diagnostic testing practices in the schools and colleges and make recommendations to the Roundtable regarding how to improve effectiveness, efficiency and coordination; and

   (b) expand the functions and funding of the California Articulation Council to include not only the development of articulation agreements in discipline areas, but also the promulgation of such agreements through the conduct of regional, intersegmental workshops by discipline;

   (c) seek legislation to extend and increase the funding for the California Academic Partnership Program;

(d) consider, in consultation with the other segments, the Task Force's preferred position concerning segmental roles in providing remediation and, as appropriate, pursue actions to implement it.

B. Direct the Chancellor to submit this item, with appropriate covering correspondence to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan, and also to the Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission as the Board's response to recommendations from Promises to Keep.

APPENDIX _____

FOOTNOTES

1. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. Sacramento, January, 1983. pp. 75-98.

2. Ibid., p. 9.

3. Ibid, p. 2.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

MAR 15 1985